



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,905	07/04/2003	Michael Harville	200312252-2	7196
22879 7590 01/07/2011 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
EXAMINER				
BIAGINI, CHRISTOPHER D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

ipa.mail@hp.com

laura.m.clark@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/613,905

Applicant(s)

HARVILLE ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER D. BIAGINI

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed September 29, 2010 (hereinafter, "the response"). Claims 1-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 1-24 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive in light of the amendments. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made. Additionally, the Examiner will address those portions of Applicant's arguments which may be relevant to any present rejections.

On pages 6-7 of the response, Applicant describes Applicant's understanding of Lai. In particular, on p. 7, Applicant states that "Applicants' understand Lai to require receiving the original content at the engine before the user can request the content." The Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant's understanding is incorrect, as this is only one embodiment of Lai. Lai contemplates, for example, that the original content can be fetched on-demand in response to the user's request. See col. 15, lines 15-20 ("Alternately, if the media content is stored externally with respect to the media transcoding engine 106, the task manager 206 can perform a network request to fetch the necessary information from the content provider's web-site"). See also col. 16, line 66 to col. 17, line 9 ("If, however, the requested media content does not reside in the transcoded cache 212...then one of the transmitter servers 200 within the machine farm 216 begins fetching the requested media content as a data stream...the requested media content can

1 initially either reside within the master archive 214 within the media transcoding engine 106, in
2 an archive external to the media transcoding engine 106, or be received as a streaming feed
3 directly from the content provider client 104”).

4 On pages 8-9 of the response, Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Lai
5 and Ooi, and that Lai and Ooi “teach away” from each other, because Lai requires receiving the
6 original content at the engine before the user can request the content, and, in Ooi, the gateways
7 receive the content after the user requests the content. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First,
8 as described above, Lai does not require that the content is received at the engine before the user
9 can request it. Second, the Examiner respectfully submits that nothing in Lai or Ooi specifically
10 criticizes, discredits, or otherwise discourages the combination. Thus, Applicant’s arguments
11 cannot be held as persuasive.

12 On pages 9-10 of the response, Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine
13 Ooi with “any other art,” because Ooi teaches away from the subject matter of the independent
14 claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ooi teaches that there is “little correlation” between
15 geographic locations, topology, and number of hops, and instead uses propagation time to decide
16 if a gateway is suitable to service a client. First, the Examiner respectfully submits that this
17 teaching does not constitute teaching away from all use of the teachings of Ooi in a system that
18 considers location. Second, the Examiner submits that “the nature of the teaching is highly
19 relevant and must be weighed in substance. A known or obvious composition does not become
20 patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for
21 the same use.” In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 554, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 13 is directed to a "system" comprising: "a plurality of service nodes for performing a streaming media service," "a mobile client," and "a service builder." Considered as a whole and in light of the specification, each of these elements may be reasonably construed as encompassing software. For example, lines 15-17 of p. 12 indicate that "the media service nodes...can each be implemented as...software." Additionally, lines 24-25 indicate that "an electronic device" is an example of a "mobile client," but this example does not explicitly exclude, for example, software clients. Finally, lines 14-16 of p. 53 indicate that "the operations of flowchart 1300 can be performed by software," and lines 2-3 of p. 60 indicate that "the operations recited herein can be performed by software." Accordingly, the claimed "system" may be reasonably construed as encompassing software per se. Software per se is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter within the meaning of 35 USC 101. The Examiner recommends amending the claim to require at least one hardware processor.

Claims 14-24 depend from claim 13, and the additionally recited limitations fail to establish that the claims are not directed to software per se for at least the following reasons:

- Claims 14-20 merely further limit the functionality performed by the software elements identified above.
- Claim 21 introduces a “service portal,” but this element may be reasonably construed as encompassing a software-based service portal.
- Claim 22 introduces “an input communication socket” and “an output communication socket,” but these elements may be reasonably construed as encompassing software constructs, such as network sockets.
- Claims 23-24 merely further limit the functionality performed by the software elements identified above.

Accordingly, the rationale presented above in connection with claim 13 applies with equal force to claims 14-20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai (US Patent No. 6,407,680) in view of Trossen (US Pub. No. 2003/0204599).

1 Regarding claim 1, Lai shows a method for managing a streaming media service, said
2 method comprising:

- 3 • receiving a request for a streaming media service (see step 502 in Fig. 5A and col. 14,
4 lines 42-44) from a mobile client (viewer client 102, which includes mobile devices
5 such as PDAs: see Fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 60-65), said streaming media service
6 comprising a plurality of media services components (comprising transcoding,
7 transmitting, and streaming: see items 218, 220, 222 in Fig. 2 and col. 10, lines 19-
8 28);
- 9 • determining which media service component of said plurality of media services
10 components to assign to a service node of a plurality of service nodes (the nodes
11 comprising machines in machine farm 216: see Fig. 2 and col. 15, lines 28-50) of a
12 network (for example, a packet-switched computer network: see Fig. 1 and col. 8,
13 lines 11-16); and
- 14 • informing each service node assigned to perform a media service component of said
15 plurality of media services components (comprising assigning a task to a machine:
16 see col. 11, lines 14-20, step 512 in Fig. 5A, and col. 15, lines 38-43), enabling said
17 streaming media service to be performed by said each assigned service node on a
18 streaming media during a media session (see steps 516-524 in Fig. 5B; col. 16, line 46
19 to col. 17, line 9; and col. 17, lines 56-63).

20 Lai does not explicitly show, in response to said mobile client moving, reassigning said
21 media session to a different service node selected from the plurality of service nodes while
22 continuing to provide the streaming media to the client.

Trossen shows, in response to a mobile client moving (comprising mobile terminal 12 moving, for example, from one administrative domain to another: see Figs. 1 and 9, and [0021]), reassigning a media session (comprising a video streaming session from content source 22: see Fig. 1 and [0020]) to a different service node selected from a plurality of service nodes (for example, reassigning a session to a new access router and/or transcoding proxy in the new administrative domain: see Figs. 1 and 9, [0021], [0026]-[0027], and [0039]) while continuing to provide streaming media to the client (see [0030]: "Accordingly, the content stream from CS 22 is not interrupted as MT 12 moves from domain 15 to domain 19").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Lai with the reassigning of Trossen in order to allow the mobile user to seamlessly transition between different service areas.

Regarding claim 2, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, and further shows wherein said streaming media is selected from video, audio, multimedia, and text (see Lai, col. 18, lines 44-55, and Table 1 on columns 18-20).

Regarding claim 3, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said determining is based on location of said client.

Trossen shows determining to assign a media service component to a service node based on the location of a client (for example, assigning a new access router or transcoding proxy based on which administrative domain the client is currently in: see Figs. 1 and 9, [0024], [0026]-[0027], [0030], and [0039]).

1 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
2 to modify the invention of Lai in view of Trossen with the determination process of Trossen in
3 order to ensure that the content being streamed to the mobile node is always adapted for its
4 current environment (see Trossen, [0029]).

5
6 Regarding claim 4, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied
7 above, but does not explicitly show wherein said determining is based on bandwidth of said
8 network.

9 Trossen shows determining to assign a media service component to a service node based
10 on bandwidth of a network (for example, determining to assign a transcoding proxy based on
11 bandwidth in the new administrative domain: see [0027] and [0029]).

12 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
13 to modify the invention of Lai in view of Trossen with the determination process of Trossen in
14 order to ensure that the content streamed to the mobile client is not interrupted due to insufficient
15 download speeds.

16
17 Regarding claim 6, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied
18 above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on load on each service node of said
19 plurality of service nodes (the load comprising CPU utilization: see Lai, col. 15, lines 43-50).

20
21 Regarding claim 7, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied
22 above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on an existing streaming media

service on said network (comprising using software residing on content provider client 104 instead of a transmitting server in machine farm 216: see Lai, Figs. 1-2 and col. 10, lines 44-49).

Regarding claim 8, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on a previously assigned media service component (comprising not assigning a transcoding server when one had previously been assigned for a particular set of media content: see Lai, col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 6).

Regarding claim 9, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, and further shows wherein said receiving said request is through a service portal (viewer web-server interface 202: see Lai, Fig. 2 and col. 14, lines 42-44).

Regarding claim 13, Lai shows a system for managing a streaming media service, said system comprising:

- a plurality of service nodes (comprising the machines in machine farm 216: see Fig. 2 and col. 15, lines 43-50) for performing a streaming media service on streaming media, said streaming media service comprising a plurality of media services components (comprising transcoding, transmitting, and streaming: see items 218, 220, and 222 of Fig. 2 and col. 10, lines 19-28);
- a mobile client for requesting said streaming media service (viewer client 102, which includes mobile devices such as PDAs: see col. 6, lines 60-65);

- 1 • a manager (resource manager 208 of Fig. 2) coupled to said plurality of service nodes
2 of a network and said client and for determining which service node to assign to
3 perform each media service component of said plurality of media services
4 components (comprising assigning a task to a machine: see step 512 in Fig. 5 and col.
5 15, lines 38-43), wherein said assigned service node is enabled to perform said
6 streaming media service on a streaming media during a media session (see steps 516-
7 524 in Fig. 5B; col. 16, line 46 to col. 17, line 9; and col. 17, lines 56-63).; and
8 • a service builder (task manager 206 of Fig. 2) coupled to said manager and for
9 communicating a list of said plurality of media services components to said manager
10 (the list comprising a set of tasks: see step 510 of Fig. 5 and col. 15, lines 27-38).

11 Lai does not explicitly show wherein the manager is configured for reassigning, in
12 response to said mobile client moving, said media session from one service node to another
13 service node selected from the plurality of service nodes while continuing to provide the
14 streaming media to the client.

15 Trossen shows, in response to a mobile client moving (comprising mobile terminal 12
16 moving, for example, from one administrative domain to another: see Figs. 1 and 9, and [0021]) ,
17 reassigning a media session (comprising a video streaming session from content source 22: see
18 Fig. 1 and [0020]) from one service node to another service node selected from a plurality of
19 service nodes (for example, reassigning a session to a new access router and/or transcoding
20 proxy in the new administrative domain: see Figs. 1 and 9, [0021], [0026]-[0027], and [0039])
21 while continuing to provide streaming media to the client (see [0030]: "Accordingly, the content
22 stream from CS 22 is not interrupted as MT 12 moves from domain 15 to domain 19").

1 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
2 to modify the system of Lai with the reassigning of Trossen in order to allow the mobile user to
3 seamlessly transition between different mobile service areas.

4
5 Regarding claim 14, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
6 above, and further shows wherein said streaming media is selected from video, audio,
7 multimedia, and text (see Lai, col. 18, lines 44-55, and Table 1 on columns 18-20).

8
9 Regarding claim 15, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
10 above, but does not explicitly show wherein said determining is based on location of said client.

11 Trossen shows determining to assign a media service component to a service node based
12 on the location of a client (for example, assigning a new access router or transcoding proxy
13 based on which administrative domain the client is currently in: see Figs. 1 and 9, [0024],
14 [0026]-[0027], [0030], and [0039]).

15 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
16 to modify the invention of Lai in view of Trossen with the determination process of Trossen in
17 order to ensure that the content being streamed to the mobile node is always adapted for its
18 current environment (see Trossen, [0029]).

19
20 Regarding claim 16, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
21 above, but does not explicitly show wherein said determining is based on bandwidth of said
22 network.

1 Trossen shows determining to assign a media service component to a service node based
2 on bandwidth of a network (for example, determining to assign a transcoding proxy based on
3 bandwidth in the new administrative domain: see [0027] and [0029]).

4 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
5 to modify the invention of Lai in view of Trossen with the determination process of Trossen in
6 order to ensure that the content streamed to the mobile client is not interrupted due to insufficient
7 download speeds.

8
9 Regarding claim 18, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
10 above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on load on each service node of said
11 plurality of service nodes (the load comprising CPU utilization: see col. 15, lines 43-50).

12
13 Regarding claim 19, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
14 above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on an existing streaming media
15 service on said network (comprising using software residing on content provider client 104
16 instead of a transmitting server in machine farm 216: see Lai, Fig. 2 and col. 10, lines 44-49).

17
18 Regarding claim 20, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
19 above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on a previously assigned media
20 service component (comprising not assigning a transcoding server when one had previously been
21 assigned for a particular set of media content: see Lai, col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 6).

22

Regarding claim 21, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied above, and further shows wherein said receiving said request is through a service portal (viewer web-server interface 202: see Lai, Fig. 2 and col. 14, lines 42-44).

Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai (US Patent No. 6,407,680) in view of Trossen (US Pub. No. 2003/0204599) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Knauerhase (US Patent No. 6,345,303).

Regarding claim 5, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on avoiding load on said network (comprising “network congestion”: see Lai, col. 15, lines 50-53), but does not explicitly show where the determining is based on the load itself.

Knauerhase shows determining a network task assignment based on load on a network (see col. 7, lines 27-33: “destination selection module 38 may choose to route the request to one of several network server computers capable of servicing the request based upon...congestion on given links to those servers (that is, load on the network)”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen with the determination process of Knauerhase in order to avoid overloading a link between servers in the network.

Regarding claim 17, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 5 as applied above, and further shows wherein said determining is based on avoiding load on said network

(comprising “network congestion”: see Lai, col. 15, lines 50-53), but does not explicitly show where the determining is based on the load itself.

Knauerhase shows determining a network task assignment based on load on a network (see col. 7, lines 27-33: “destination selection module 38 may choose to route the request to one of several network server computers capable of servicing the request based upon...congestion on given links to those servers (that is, load on the network”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen with the determination process of Knauerhase in order to avoid overloading a link between servers in the network.

Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai (US Patent No. 6,407,680) in view of Trossen (US Pub. No. 2003/0204599) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Coile (US Patent No. 6,473,406).

Regarding claim 10, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, and further shows generating an input communication connection and an output communication connection for each assigned service node to enable communication between said assigned service nodes (inherently disclosed as being a necessary part of the process by which the servers receive and send data from other servers, for example as it is passed from a transmitting server to a transcoding server to a streaming server, as it is necessary to create input and output connections to receive and send data over a network; see Lai, col. 10, lines 19-33 and col. 16, line 46 to col. 17, line 60).

1 Note that in addition to enabling communication between assigned service nodes, the
2 input and output communication connections enable retrieving media content and sending it to a
3 viewer client (see Lai, col. 15, lines 30-35).

4 Lai in view of Trossen does not explicitly show that the communication connections are
5 sockets.

6 Coile shows using input and output sockets to traverse a network node (see Fig. 7 and
7 col. 11, lines 5-22).

8 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
9 to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen with the sockets of Coile in order to improve
10 interoperability and speed development of the system through the use of a standardized and well-
11 known network communication model.

12
13 Regarding claim 22, Lai in view of Trossen shows the limitations of claim 13 as applied
14 above, and further shows wherein each of said plurality of service nodes generates an input
15 communication connection and an output communication connection to enable communication
16 between assigned service nodes (inherently disclosed as being a necessary part of the process by
17 which the servers receive and send data from other servers, for example as it is passed from a
18 transmitting server to a transcoding server to a streaming server, as it is necessary to create input
19 and output connections to receive and send data over a network; see Lai, col. 10, lines 19-33 and
20 col. 16, line 46 to col. 17, line 60).

Note that in addition to enabling communication between assigned service nodes, the input and output communication connections enable retrieving media content and sending it to a viewer client (see Lai, col. 15, lines 30-35).

Lai in view of Trossen does not explicitly show that the communication connections are sockets.

Coile shows using input and output sockets to traverse a network node (see Fig. 7 and col. 11, lines 5-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen with the sockets of Coile in order to improve interoperability and speed development of the system through the use of a standardized and well-known network communication model.

Claims 11, 12, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai (US Patent No. 6,407,680) in view of Trossen (US Pub. No. 2003/0204599) and Coile (US Patent No. 6,473,406) as applied to claims 10 and 22 above, and further in view of Wei Tsang Ooi et al. ("Distributing Media Transformation Over Multiple Media Gateways," hereinafter "Ooi").

Regarding claim 11, Lai in view of Trossen and Coile shows the limitations of claim 10 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said input communication socket enables decompressing said streaming media.

Ooi shows a group of assigned service nodes (comprising media gateways: see Fig. 1A), each of which has generated a module enabling receiving and decompressing streaming media (for example, as described in 1.4, each gateway must have software to decompress a media stream).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen and Coile with the media gateways and modules of Ooi in order to distribute the load of transforming media among multiple devices (see Ooi, paragraph 3 of section 1.1).

Regarding claim 12, Lai in view of Trossen and Coile shows the limitations of claim 10 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said out communication socket enables compressing said streaming media.

Ooi shows a group of assigned service nodes (comprising media gateways: see Fig. 1A), each of which has generated a module enabling compressing and sending streaming media (for example, as described in 1.4, each gateway must have software to compress a media stream).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen and Coile with the media gateways and modules of Ooi in order to distribute the load of transforming media among multiple devices (see Ooi, paragraph 3 of section 1.1).

Regarding claim 23, Lai in view of Trossen and Coile shows the limitations of claim 22 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said input communication socket enables decompressing said streaming media.

Ooi shows a group of assigned service nodes (comprising media gateways: see Fig. 1A), each of which has generated a module enabling receiving and decompressing streaming media (for example, as described in 1.4, each gateway must have software to decompress a media stream).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen and Coile with the media gateways and modules of Ooi in order to distribute the load of transforming media among multiple devices (see Ooi, paragraph 3 of section 1.1).

Regarding claim 24, Lai in view of Trossen and Coile shows the limitations of claim 22 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said output communication socket enables compressing said streaming media.

Ooi shows a group of assigned service nodes (comprising media gateways: see Fig. 1A), each of which has generated a module enabling compressing and sending streaming media (for example, as described in 1.4, each gateway must have software to compress a media stream).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Lai in view of Trossen and Coile with the media gateways and modules of Ooi in order to distribute the load of transforming media among multiple devices (see Ooi, paragraph 3 of section 1.1).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- US Pub. No. 2002/0080215 to Wu shows a system for seamlessly migrating from one transcoding proxy to another when a mobile device moves between service areas.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER D. BIAGINI whose telephone number is (571)272-9743. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher D. Biagini/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445